

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 09/251,133 | 02/16/1999 | GIRISH V. SHAH | 70009590-001 | 2869 | |
| 75 | 90 02/11/2003 | | | | |
| JOSEPH A. MAHONEY MAYER, BROWN & PLATT P.O. BOX 2828 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2828 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H | | |
| CHICAGO, IL | 00090-2828 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1642 | 27 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003 | DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application N | o. • | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 09/251,133 | ~ | SHAH, GIRISH V. | | | |
| | | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Christopher H | Yaen | 1642 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2002. | | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | , | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6,8-10 and 22-29</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,3,5,7 and 11-21</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| · | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| • | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers | election requi | rement. | | | | |
| | • | • | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| , | | | • | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>26</u> | 4) [5) [6. 6] | | r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/21/2002 has been entered.
- 2. Currently claims 1-29 are pending, claims 6,8-10, and 22-29 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected subject matter. Applicant is reminded to cancel all non-elected claims.
- 3. Claims 2,3,5,7 and 11-21 are examined on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The Information Disclosure Statement filed 10/26/2002 (paper no. 26) is acknowledged and considered. A signed copy of the IDS is attached hereto.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn- 35 USC § 112

5. The rejections of claims 2,3, and 5 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as lacking proper written description is withdrawn in view of the arguments set forth by the applicant.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn- 35 USC § 112

6. The rejections of claims 2,3, and 5 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as lacking an enabling disclosure is withdrawn in view of the arguments set forth by the applicant.

Art Unit: 1642

New Claim Rejections- 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 2,3,5, and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116).

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 115).

The claims of the instant invention are drawn to an isolated polypeptide that comprises an amino acid of SEQ ID No: 6. It appear from the specification that SEQ ID No: 6 is a polypeptide fragment that can be found as part of a larger protein yet to be described. However, the specification has not disclosed any other portions or parts of the the larger protein from which the instant invention intends to encompass within its claims. The specification has not taught the specific amino acid sequences which may flank either sides of the peptide fragment of SEQ ID No: 6. As such, the specification has only taught SEQ ID No: 6 and no other.

Art Unit: 1642

Furthermore, although drawn specifically drawn to the DNA art the findings of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412) are clearly applicable to the instant rejection. The court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states that "An adequate written description of a DNA...'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties', not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention".

Therefore only an isolated polypeptide molecule having an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO. 6 meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1642

communications.

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1642 February 9, 2003 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5